

that serve to threaten our future national security as well as the standard of living for the American people."

The Federal budget continues to grow way beyond the ability of the family budget to pay for it, and seemingly, the only standard for spending the people's money today is do we have a noble purpose, and can some good use be made of the money. But, Mr. Chairman, that standard is not sufficient. It's not sufficient when we're threatening future generations with a fiscal calamity. Sooner or later, this body needs to say enough is enough.

Almost every State in the Union, I think, save but two or three, are running a surplus. We're running a deficit, and what are we doing? We're funding local parking facilities.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I'm not here to debate the constitutionality of doing that, but, again, I'm here to debate the wisdom, given the fiscal challenges the Nation faces, and all too often I fear that this body is more focused on the next election and not the next generation. But the Comptroller General has said we're on the verge of being the first generation in America's history to leave the next generation with a lower standard of living.

Mr. Chairman, fiscal responsibility has to be included in each and every bill, and we have a bill that's growing about 6.7 percent. Let's somewhere draw a line in the sand on behalf of American families, on behalf of American taxpayers, on behalf of future generations and just say, you know, today the Federal taxpayer and future generations are not going to have to pay for parking facilities. It's all this amendment is about, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, the author of this amendment is undoubtedly trying to get at some egregious earmarks that are funded in this bill or in some other bill; however, in drafting a provision that is so broad in scope that what we have is an amendment that's careless.

There are legitimate parking facilities that can be built using Federal funds, and I use an example, for instance, the parking facilities that we have with elder housing projects, built in various places around the country, but this amendment would kill that.

Under current law Federal funds can be used to fund park-and-ride facilities and other activities aimed at encouraging carpooling and vanpooling. In fact, these activities are of such a high priority that they're eligible for 100 percent Federal funding and require no State or local match. Similarly, Federal funds are used to build safety rest areas along our interstates. This amendment would put an end to that.

For these reasons and others, this amendment must be defeated.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLVER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I would just point out that this bill funds what we call the 811 program, housing for disabled. Now, I don't know why we would want to say that we would vote money to build housing for the disabled but no parking. Have we found a new group of totally mobile disabled?

I mean, this amendment would say that if you got funds under the 811 program to build housing for disabled people, you couldn't provide parking for vans, for transportation. I'm really baffled as to the scope, and I do think that telling people that they could not provide parking at a disabled housing facility is a very poor idea.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, this money's going to have to come from somewhere. So, again, I would invite the committee chairman to tell us, is this part of the largest tax increase in history? Is this coming out of the Social Security Trust Fund? Is this going to be debt passed on to future generations? Where is the money going to come from? Does it reach that purpose?

And I cannot believe that the only parking lots that are made available to those who are disabled are somehow coming from the Federal taxpayer. I just don't believe it.

With that, I would urge an "aye" vote.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the back the balance of my time.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, the answer to the gentleman from Texas is when you have federally funded housing for the disabled, the parking that goes for the disabled and the service vehicles comes from that money. So the gentleman says, why does the Federal Government have to pay for parking? I don't know who else the gentleman thinks is going to pay for parking at housing that is built for people who are disabled.

If the gentleman is unhappy with this, then perhaps he should draft his amendments more seriously.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR).

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for yielding.

Parking facilities are eligible under a number of our surface transportation

programs, funded out of the Highway Trust Fund. In the SAFETEA-LU legislation, we authorize funding for parking facilities to encourage commuters to park their vehicles and use public transportation.

Congestion is a growing problem all across this country. It costs us \$68 billion a year. The more cars we can get off the roadway and more people use public transportation, the better off citizens are in their drive patterns. And the parking facilities encourage carpooling, vanpooling and use of light rail and commuter rail and local bus transit operations.

Furthermore, because they're funded with Highway Trust Fund moneys, no fees can be charged at these parking facilities, so they're not revenue-generating activities.

Furthermore, we have imposed very strict standards for highway safety for long-haul truckers. Hours of service have been limited so that roadways will be safer, but those long-haul truckers, working long hours, need safe places where they can rest.

□ 1715

The hours of service limitation requires them to stay off the roadway before they become fatigued. That's why we have parking facilities to accommodate over-the-road truck drivers, as well as passenger vehicle drivers.

So the parking facilities we provide under the SAFETEA-LU national transportation program is in the best public interest, in the interest of public safety and in the interest of roadway safety, to the best interest of the driving public, reduces congestion, and we ought not to take this broad brush stroke and strike the spending.

No, we carefully considered these issues in the course of fashioning the SAFETEA-LU in the House and the Senate and conference and on this House floor. Let's keep existing policy in place and defeat this misguided amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas will be postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 14 by Mr. WESTMORELAND of Georgia.

Amendment No. 15 by Mr. SESSIONS of Texas.

An amendment by Mr. FLAKE of Arizona regarding Belmont Complex.